

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF FINE ARTS

Council Meeting - Date: May 6, 1977

PRESENT: Dean A. Pinsky, Chairman, Assoc. Dean E.F. Cooke,
Asst. Dean G. Gross, Profs. J. Cazalet, E. James,
J.A. Kelly, W. Krol, J. Locke, F.R. Mulvey, W. Reznicek,
K. Sloan, J.I. Smith, G.R. Walters, Dr. A. Broes.

1. Notice of Motion

Asst. Dean Gross noted that the Arts & Science faculty somehow managed to table an abstract of the minutes of Senate which was a record of the motions passed at Senate. He felt that this would be a very useful way of circulating information to the Faculty in Fine Arts.

He therefore asked Council to direct the Secretary of Senate to prepare such an abstract as a regular aspect of its preparation of the minutes, and that this be done for the Faculty of Fine Arts on a regular basis.

2. Senate Document - Competence in Written Expression (US-77-8-02)

Dean Pinsky explained that the problems raised by this particular report were not something that this University had chosen to stress but concerned all universities in Canada and the United States. With respect to the landed immigrant aspect of the student population, there had been stories circulated that these students could pass through the university without being able to read or write English. The document was offering a number of proposals, the financial aspect are dealt with, and the recommendations could be found on Page Nine.

He explained that Council was being asked to comment on the document.

Asst. Prof. Broes explained that the Loyola Department of English had had no voice at all in the drawing up of this document at Sir George, and that representatives were going to appear before the Arts Council soon to ask that the motion be tabled. In the light of the merger of departments, it is felt that the document is premature. The department was not opposed to the proposals in general, but because they had been so largely excluded, they would request that the report be tabled.

Assoc. Prof. J. Locke noted that one of the suggestions in the report was that the remedial program be handled by an administrative unit separate from the English Department.

Asst. Prof. Broes replied that Item No. 11 of the report is predicated upon the acceptance of the previous 10, and that there was considerable reservations about this possibility. The two departments had not had a chance to get together on the problem since they knew nothing about it until the report finally came down.

Asst. Dean Gross explained that what happened in the two departments was somewhat different. The subcommittee had developed some of the recommendations. In addition the report was drawn up by J. Whitelaw over a period of about a year. Considerable deliberation of the report took place every Monday over a long period of time by UCCC. The recommendations have very large scale ramifications throughout the University in order to carry out these requirements. For example, the new credit requirements and an across-the-University mechanism for the testing of these requirements.

He further explained that the report was not necessarily directed at non-anglaphones, but rather directed at incompetent students in English.

In this Faculty regarding the distribution of information, minutes were distributed to our curriculum committee. We have made numerous revisions to the document. His understanding was that Senate had already passed recommendation No. 11 and did so at the last meeting. The UCCC was now empowered to set up a Committee to see to its implementation.

Asst. Prof. Reznicek questioned what part of the student body the report was dealing with. If it did not deal with the French speaking student, but only to the anglophones, then it was only really addressing one quarter of the problems of competence in English among our students.

Asst. Dean Gross explained that if we tried to make a recommendation to cover both French and English students, would we then be testing their competence as English speakers in their mother tongue or are they being tested for a second language. There are two issues which should be dealt with separately.

Asst. Prof. Reznicek asked how we were going to distinguish between people who are Anglaphone and non-anglaphone because there were other uses of other languages in the university.

Dean Pinsky explained that this report and the UCCC and RACCA discussions of it were all related to the question of the foreign student. Had Bill 1 been in the works earlier, he questioned whether it would have come out in the same way. There is a certain symmetry between this report and the foreign student. Many of these students must pass an examination in their homeland. They arrive barely speaking English. Whether Bill 1, in fact, would extend the notion of the foreign student studying in French or not, foreign students study English.

Asst. Dean Gross noted that there was a course called English 100 which is appropriate to foreign students. According to the calendar, credit is granted for it. There is no prerequisite. The University is saying one thing, and the calendar is saying another.

Dean Pinsky suggested that this document was produced at the wrong time, unfortunately, because so much effort has been put into it. It would seem proposal No. 11 will probably have to come to grips with the reality of the other situation.

Asst. Dean Gross felt that Council did not really have any motion to put forward to Senate regarding this document.

Dean Pinsky explained that all that could be done was report to Senate on the kind of discussions and concerns the Council had on this question.

3. Curriculum Report - Constitution of Faculty Curriculum Committee

Asst. Dean Gross explained that the Faculty Curriculum Committee had come to the conclusion that it would prefer more consideration of curriculum matters be given at the level where the curriculum development is taking place. He hoped that more people would be concerned for their sections and division in the formulation of curriculum. It could then be scrutinized by a smaller Faculty Committee who specialized in the implications across the Faculty.

Assoc. Prof. Cazalet asked if there was any criteria on which a Curriculum Committee made its determinations?

Asst. Dean Gross answered that a set of guidelines would have to evolve. The Faculty Curriculum Committee feels it has a mandate to discuss curriculum and recommend to the Division as well as accept or veto proposals. If it feels that there are no divisional committees to look more broadly at questions of curriculum, then the faculty committee must involve itself elsewhere.

Asst. Prof. Reznicek felt that in the case of the Theatre submission, this idea is simplistic since instead of the difficulties arising at the faculty level, the division would come forward with proposals in agreement with its own philosophy. There is a gap in the studying of curriculum on a Faculty-wide level. As I understand the mandate of the curriculum committee is to review submissions that arise from the sections. Yet, there is concern from the Dean's office about the overall philosophy of education in the faculty. However, part of the mandate of the Curriculum Committee is to see that overall philosophy is adhered to. There does not seem to be a place where the philosophy can meet. I don't see how your proposals will adjust itself to that particular problem.

Asst. Prof. Walter asked if this report does not fall in the same possible limbo in view of the complications that are presently going on regarding the restructuring of the faculty itself, i.e. the formation of departments. To question at this time what a division means in our faculty strikes me as "quixotic."

Asst. Dean Gross answered that the faculty has a need right now for additional membership to serve on that committee or the establishment of levels of curriculum development. We want to involve faculty in considerations of curriculum development. We want to involve faculty on an ongoing basis on the question of education in relation to others, etc., with the possibility of something happening as a result of this discussion. We should set up whatever structures are necessary to stimulate a wider section of our faculty to join us in these concerns.

Asst. Prof. Walters felt that it should be up to the Division to strengthen discussions of curriculum without changing the current committee status. Once the Division knows where curriculum discussions should take place, then the faculty curriculum committee guidelines would be strengthened.

After further discussion, Asst. Dean Gross noted that no consensus has been reached. He asked if Council wished the Faculty Curriculum Committee to make whatever appointments necessary to the existing committee in order that it conduct its business properly?

Asst. Prof. Walters explained that in view of the fact that Council had not received a written report and therefore could not make a formal motion, this matter should be included on the agenda for the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.